

August 2, 1974

brance of the Warsaw uprising as a symbol of the fight for freedom which continues from generation to generation throughout the world.

**MANY HELPED IN SUCCESSFUL  
TELEVISED JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

**HON. ROBERT MCCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the great public interest in the recent televised meetings of the House Judiciary Committee—a first in congressional history—drew huge crowds and representatives of the media from throughout the world to view this most dramatic and challenging action.

Mr. Speaker, sufficient laurels have been heaped upon the members of our committee, all of whom performed their jobs with dignity. However, there are many others who contributed to make these public meetings successful and effective vehicles for communicating the committee's deliberative proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, the unsung heroes and heroines of this final phase of the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry were our capable Sergeant at Arms Ken Harding and the various staff personnel who manned room 2141 in the Rayburn Building, particularly during the recent televised debates.

Mr. Speaker, first, of course, are the impeachment inquiry staff members—ably headed by Chief Counsel John Doar, Chief Minority Counsel Sam Garrison, and Associate Committee Counsel Albert E. Jenner, Jr. Those who served with them, including both majority and minority counsel—are entitled to equal praise. Of equal importance were the committee's own Chief Counsel Jerome Zelfman, and Chief Minority Counsel Franklin G. Polk, who with their assistants backed up the chairman and all the members of the committee throughout this prolonged period.

Mr. Speaker, the media contacts and facilities were responsibly handled under the direction of our radio and TV director Mike Michaelson, and assisted by Tina Tate and Larry May. The writing press was served ably by our Press Gallery Superintendent Ben West and his assistant Jerry Gallegos. David Holmes, superintendent of the periodical gallery, provided other support to the media interests. The limited seating for members of the press and the restricted guest accommodations were allocated equitably and smoothly by Helen Starr. The majority staff facilities were under the capable supervision of Theresa Gallo. The minority staff room served the demands and needs of the Republican members and their staffs with the assistance of Nancy Parke.

Mr. Speaker, with the large number of media representatives and public visitors, throughout the meetings the Capitol Police under Captain Price maintained tight security and good order.

Mr. Speaker, Louise Vance handled the public address system as the skilled technician that he is—with the result that the more bombastic remarks were modulated and the quiet voices were adequately amplified so that every word of the weeklong meetings was capable of being heard.

Mr. Speaker, while many hearings of Senate committees and some House committee hearings have been televised in the past, this was our first experience with televised committee meetings. From the remarks that I have heard from our colleagues we can all feel proud of this example of a House committee at work. Assuming to speak on behalf of the committee, I am confident that I voice the appreciation of all committee members—for the supporting and sustaining roles which all of those whom I have mentioned and many others provided during these trying and historic days.

**AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT  
OF 1954 AND ATOMIC WEAPONS  
REWARDS ACT OF 1955**

SPEECH OF

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15416), to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does it to conform the procedure of congressional control with respect to the transfer of certain amounts of special nuclear material to the procedure established by my amendment offered yesterday with respect to international nuclear agreements.

The amendment offered yesterday required congressional approval before any further international agreements can take place with respect to sales of nuclear reactors and materials. My amendment today does the same thing with respect to the transfer of certain amounts of special nuclear material to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Let me point out that the Joint Committee is proposing to conform to the procedure is suggested in H.R. 15582, allowing congressional veto by concurrent resolution. All my amendment does is insure that we adopt the same procedure for sales to IAEA and as this House approved yesterday for bilateral agreements. If we do not adopt my conforming amendment, there will exist a sizable loophole by which the President could export nuclear fuel with very limited congressional check.

There presently exists a very broad agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency under which reactors and fuel can be sold to third countries.

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee amendment would allow unlimited nuclear fuel to be transferred to the IAEA,

and then to third countries, with only a flimsy check of the veto by resolution, which this House rejected yesterday.

We have no control over reactors supplied to third countries through the IAEA, and if the committee amendment is not made to conform with the controls we approved yesterday Congress will have only the weakest check on fuel transfers.

The committee, arguing that if we do not approve their bill, we will not have any bill, because the President will veto. I am pointing out that even if you have a bill, the committee bill is not worth a cent because when it starts to rain the roof will leak.

The concurrent resolution has absolutely no constitutional standing; if the President wants to veto it he can, because the Constitution says specifically that all concurrent resolutions must be signed by the President, and exempts only motions to adjourn and constitutional amendments. Those are the only exceptions. There has never been a case in which any court test has been made which would uphold the committee position.

I urge that the House support my amendment because it does what we tried to do yesterday, putting the Congress on record that we who represent the people of the United States want to have something to say about transfers of nuclear reactors and nuclear materials.

This amendment of mine closes a very important loophole. Let us get a test now. If the President vetoes it, at least we have made a confrontation now, and not someday when it might be much more important than it is at the present time.

I urge an "aye" vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

**CONCERN EXPRESSED FOR CERTAIN  
ENDANGERED SPECIES UNLESS  
NEW RIVER IS SAVED**

**HON. WILMER MIZELL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, there is strong opposition to the proposed Blue Ridge power project in Virginia and North Carolina. One reason that many oppose this project is the significant adverse environmental effects which will result from this needless impoundment of the New River.

At my request, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior studied the effects of the proposed Blue Ridge project on the unique fauna of the area. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues their disturbing report on the destruction of certain endangered species which will result if the New River is not saved.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,

Washington, D.C.  
Congressman WILMER D. MIZELL,  
Cannon Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIZELL: This is in reply to a telephone request requesting names of fish, molluscs or crustaceans in the New River in

E 5242

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

August 2, 1974

North Carolina, Virginia, or West Virginia that are considered candidates for the official list of endangered species. In particular, you inquired about the status of the New River snail. You wished to know which species would benefit if the New River was included in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Finally, you asked us to review the final environmental impact statement, June 1973, of the Modified Blue Ridge Project Number 2317, North Carolina and Virginia.

The following five fish, one snail, three crustaceans, and two pearly mussels are found in or near the area you outlined and are considered candidates for the official list of endangered species, or in the case of two of the crustaceans, are considered candidates for the official list of threatened species likely to become endangered:

The Kanawha minnow, *Phoxinotus teretulus*, a large stream fish; the fat-head chub, *Noemis platycephalus*; the New River shiner, *Notropis scabripes*; the Kanawha darter, *Etheostoma kanawhae*; and probably the fine-scale darter, *Etheostoma caeruleum*. These species are restricted to the New River system in North Carolina, Virginia, and possibly West Virginia.

The New River snail, *Polysphincta virginiana*, particularly merits preservation because it is the only species in the genus. Thus the genus appears to be endangered and preservation of this animal would be an important contribution toward maintaining a diversity of animal life in the country. It is known only from a small area of a single river bluff opposite Radford in Pulaski County, Virginia. There are only a few hundred individuals at most in existence. The ephemeral cave scud, *Apocerges ephemerus*, a blind white cave crustacean, found in small mandibottomed cave pools, is known only from Tawney's Cave and Cance Cave in Giles County, Virginia. These two caves occur in Sinking Creek valley, a small tributary of the New River, and the inclusion of a small section of this creek adjoining the New River, in a legislated wild and scenic area, would greatly benefit the continued existence of this species.

Mackin's cave scud, *Stygobromus mackini*, is found in caves in Giles County, Virginia, and several other counties and is considered a candidate for the list of threatened species. The spiny cave scud, *Stygocentrus spinosus*, is known only from the Greenbrier valley, a tributary of the New River in West Virginia. One unique subspecies of the spiny cave scud is found only in central Monroe County and would justify inclusion of a short section of the Greenbrier River adjoining the New River in the designated natural area.

It is estimated that West Virginia has lost about 90 percent of its fresh water mussels because of pollution from strip mining and other factors. Best remaining populations are in the Greenbrier River, the New River Gorge below Hinton, the Elk River tributary of the Kanawha River, and in the six-mile stretch of the Kanawha River immediately below Kanawha Falls. In this stretch of river are found the tubercled-brown pearly mussel, *Epioblasma torulosa* *rossi*, and the pink mucket, *Lempeilis orbiculata*. These two mussels appear to be on the verge of extinction. International concern has been expressed over the plight of these species. They appear in Appendix B of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Please find enclosed a copy of this convention which was signed on March 3, 1973, ratified by the United States Senate, and implemented in the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

The New River is a misconcept. This river is believed to be the oldest river in North America. It crosses the continental divide because it existed prior to the existence of

the Appalachian Mountains. This may be one reason so many unusual species exist in the New River.

Available habitat for these eleven species has already been lost including the Kanawha River below Charleston, which is severely polluted, the impounded sections of the New River above Hinton and Radford, and impounded sections of the Elk and Gauley tributaries. Each of these eleven species is jeopardized by one or more of the following factors: acid mine wastes, municipal waste, proposed impoundments, over collecting, quarrying, road construction, ground water pollution, channelization, and the downstream effects of channelization of small tributaries, such as Cherry River and Paint Creek.

The impact statement for Project Number 2317, impoundments at Galax and Independence, Virginia, states on page 26 that "... no rare or endangered species have been reported or are known to exist in the project area." Reference is made to the Big-mouth chub, the New River shiner, the Kanawha darter, and the Kanawha minnow. Entirely omitted is any consideration that the creation of the two impoundments might make them endangered.

Sincerely,  
JOHN PARASMO,  
Chief, Branch of Biological Support Office of Endangered Species and International Activity.

A LONG STAY IN POWER FOR MILITARY JUNTA IN CHILE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON  
OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. Speaker, in the same week in which a Chilean military court sentenced four persons to death by firing squad for essentially political offenses, we learn in a comprehensive report from Santiago, by Joseph Novitski of the Washington Post, that plans for continued military rule in Chile are "for the long term and on a large scale." The article once again makes the obvious point that the military junta will remain a near-permanent fixture on the Chilean political scene unless the United States joins other Western nations in taking firm steps to withdraw our support for the junta.

In the pending foreign military aid request for Chile, the Congress has an opportunity to assert our influence against continued military rule and political trials in Chile. By unconditionally terminating all military assistance to the junta, the United States will put those rulers on notice that their policies no longer meet with our support. It is inconsistent with our asserted interest in human rights to ignore the existing situation in Chile by continuing our military aid program. I urge my colleagues to read the Washington Post article describing the prospects for continued military rule in Chile, and to consider taking a stand in favor of a termination of all U.S. military aid to Chile so that the unfortunate predictions coming out of Santiago may be proven untrue.

The text of the article follows:

CHILE JUNTA DEALS DEMOCRACY OUT OF LONG-TERM PLANS

(By Joseph Novitski)

SANTIAGO.—The Chilean military junta, after governing for 10 months with improvised policies and structures, has settled down for a long stay in power.

The junta, which replaced President Salvador Allende after the coup in which he died last September, began its tenth month by reordering the country's government, burning the national voter registry and breaking off relations with Chile's largest political party, the Christian Democrats. It all added up to a declaration that the military plans to govern for an indefinite span, without elections or organized civilian political support.

Government spokesmen, when asked how long military rule may last, answer, "We have plans, not deadlines."

The plans are for the long term and on a large scale.

"If we don't do big, lasting things, we might as well go home now," an adviser to the junta said recently.

Thus far, in what it calls "the second stage," the junta has made known its intention to rebuild the economy, to make it grow with the help of foreign investment, to reduce and reorganize the government bureaucracy and to enforce a total ban on civilian political activity by continuing the detentions and military-court trials that have been the rule since last September.

The first step of government reorganization came late in June, when the armed forces agreed to shift from a four-man junta to a one-man presidency. Since the military overthrew Allende and uprooted his Marxist-oriented government, the commanders of the army, the navy, the air force and the carabineros, Chile's national police force, had exercised the powers of the presidency. They also took over the law-making power of the Congress, which was closed last year.

Now Gen. Augusto Pinochet, commander-in-chief of the army and leader of the junta has been named president for an indefinite term with the formal title of "supreme chief of the nation."

The point of the change, government sources said, was efficiency. The four-man junta had been slower in reaching decisions than one man would be, they said. The commanders of the army, navy, air force and police have retained the role of drawing up laws for promulgation by decree.

Pinochet's rise also represents an ascendancy of the Chilean army over the navy, air force and police. Some civilian observers, believing that the army officers in government had shown more moderation than air force and navy officers, thought this might mean an easing of repression. This has not yet been the case.

Chilean families report that men and women are still disappearing for days and sometimes weeks. A businessman told friends recently he had been arrested, held for four days alone in a tiny cell and then released without charges.

While Gen. Pinochet was forming a new cabinet of 14 military men and 3 civilians, two of them technocrats with international reputations, the government burned the national voter registration records. A government spokesman explained that the lists of 4 million voters were "notoriously fraudulent." No plans were announced for making new lists or reregistering voters.

The remote expectation that the junta might call elections to carry out its announced aim of restoring Chilean democracy disappeared with the electoral records. There remained another possibility, suggested to the junta by leaders of the Christian Democratic Party. The party leadership, who op-

August 2, 1974

E 5243

posed, Allende and publicly accepted the coup as a necessary evil, had hoped for a return to civilian government within three to five years.

That hope, according to Christian Democrats familiar with party affairs, disappeared when the junta publicly broke off its semi-public relations with the party last week. Formally, there has been no political party activity in Chile since the junta outlawed the country's Marxist parties and declared the others, including the Christian Democrats, in recess.

During the recess, Christian Democratic leaders continued to meet privately. Last January they presented a memorandum to the government that criticized the military's treatment of prisoners and its disregard for legal and human rights. Also in January, former Sen. Patricio Aylwin, recognized by the junta as the party's president, suggested privately to a military minister that Christian Democrats saw no need for more than five years of military dictatorship in Chile.

It was not Christian Democratic political opinions, but censorship imposed on a Santiago radio station owned by the party that caused the party's complete break with the junta.

After an exchange of letters, the government called the party an "instrument of international Marxism" and told Aylwin bluntly to keep a respectful tongue in his head when he spoke to the military government.

Christian Democrats said the government's move looked like a signal from the army that its contacts with Christian Democrats were at an end.

Some party leaders said the break helped the party overcome the reputation of having helped in the coup. Even former President Eduardo Frei, the grand old man of Chilean Christian Democracy who had gone, with other former presidents, to a thanksgiving Mass with the junta last year, was reliably reported to be critical of the military government now.

"In the end it's probably better this way," said a Christian Democratic lawyer. "They tell us to shut up and we stop arguing. It shows everyone that this is a dictatorship and that's that."

#### SEVENTY-THREE SOCIALISTS ON TRIAL IN SOUTHERN CHILE

SANTIAGO, August 1.—Seventy-three members of the outlawed Socialist Party are being tried on charges ranging from the illegal possession of arms to treason by a court martial in the town of Linares, about 172 miles south of Santiago, lawyers for the accused said today.

The lawyers said the prosecutor had demanded death penalties for four of the defendants charged with assisting the enemy during a state of internal war.

#### WILDERNESS WEST—WILDERNESS EAST

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and thoughtful article appeared in the June, 1974 edition of Conservation News, written by Mr. Charles L. Cadieux, and entitled "Wilderness West—Wilderness East." Some may find themselves in partial disagreement with several of the possibilities suggested by the article. I believe that Mr. Cadieux expresses some

extremely thought provoking concepts, worthy of consideration.

Mr. Cadieux proposes the establishment of wilderness areas in the East, where the need for such areas is the most acute, and where the passage of time only serves to exacerbate the situation. However, Mr. Cadieux proposes more than the simple setting aside of existing wilderness areas, but imaginatively suggests that we create wilderness in places where none exists, and that we manage that wilderness for everyone's benefit. The proposal is particularly intriguing when one considers the lack of any substantial natural wilderness in the East.

The Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands has under consideration legislation which I am cosponsoring to establish various eastern wilderness areas, and to study other areas for possible future inclusion in the wilderness system. I wish to applaud the committee's action and trust that we shall be able to move on this much needed legislation.

I now include in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues, the text of Mr. Cadieux's article:

#### WILDERNESS WEST—WILDERNESS EAST (By Charles L. Cadieux)

The Wilderness Act Completed ten years of life on September 8, 1973.

The question "Has it worked? would bring different answers from east and west.

The Wilderness System began 1964 with 54 areas created from the United States Forest Service's Primitive Areas and from parts of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in northern Minnesota. Today, in the Wilderness System, there are 95 units totaling more than 11 million acres. Some 62 more areas totaling 7.5 million acres are being considered by Congress. And 27 more are to be reviewed and reported on to the Congress. These 95 areas comprise almost 46 million additional acres!

The great bulk of the lands already included in the Wilderness System lie in the west. Bob Rowe, of the United States Forest Service told me that the Forest Service areas under current consideration include only three areas in the eastern half of the United States—Bradwell Bay in Florida, Joyce Kilmer-Slick Rock in North Carolina, and El Cacicue in Puerto Rico.

How have the big three land-managing federal agencies rated their cooperation with the terms of the Wilderness Act? Their accomplishment depends entirely upon how they see the Wilderness Act in reference to their primary purpose.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has responded quite enthusiastically. It feels that wilderness area status is in agreement with its primary purpose of protecting and managing the wildlife on that property.

The National Park Service, which manages just a little less acreage than does the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, gets only so-so ratings from the superficial observer. In some areas, the Park Service sees wilderness status as being in agreement with its purpose of preserving the out-of-doors. In other areas, the Park Service sees the wilderness concept as a handicap to its purpose of showing the out-of-doors to as many people as possible.

The greatest portion of both BSF&W and NPS lands is the western half of the United States.

The United States Forest Service manages far more land than both the Department of the Interior agencies. How has it done? Again, we get two answers. West of the Mississippi, the Forest Service has designated huge acre-

ages as wilderness. But it has failed miserably in the eastern half of the nation. Asked why this should be, the Forest Service people remind you that the Wilderness Act said that there could not be a wilderness where the signs of man's habitation—or use—of the land for a home was visible. The joke has it: "Where the hand of man has never set foot."

The Forest Service has argued that an area must be primitive—virgin timber, where man is but a visitor—or else it cannot qualify as part of the Wilderness System. That is—east of the Mississippi they argue this way.

The first wilderness proposed in our nation was the Gila Wilderness area, carved out of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico at Forest Service recommendation. This was in 1924, about 40 years before the environmentalists sponsored legislation which led to the Wilderness Act. The Gila boasts cliff dwellings—signs of man's habitation from pre-Columbian times.

This was the first of all wilderness areas in not an area where "the hand of man has never set foot." It is a beautiful wilderness area. So is the Pecos Wilderness of the Santa Fe National Forest to the north, which boasts of "Bobby's Cabin" and other signs of former habitation.

If you look hard, you can find signs of man's former use in every single one of the country's wilderness areas. This has not diminished their value as wilderness one iota.

Professional foresters, men who look at the problem without emotion, tell me that we can produce wilderness almost anywhere we want to—anywhere plants will grow—if we are willing to invest the time and the money to do it.

Produce wilderness? Why not? It should be obvious that the healing hand of nature can reclaim all but the most sacrilegious treatment of the land. Even strip mines, ghastly crimes against the earth, can be made to produce a wilderness area, if the American public is willing to pay the bill. In addition to money, it will take time. But even the longest restoration job only needs to be started sooner, not surrendered without an attempt.

Congress never intended that the strict construction of the Act's wording should prevent inclusion of worthy areas into the system. Senator Church was floor manager of the bill when it passed the Senate in 1963. He said then, "It is one of the great promises of the Wilderness Act that we can dedicate formerly abused areas where the primitive scene can be restored by natural forces."

Congress in 1963 had no delusions that an area had to be pristine, never timbered, never plowed, never broken by the homesteader's cabin. It is much more likely that Congress envisioned the restoration of land to wilderness quality by proper management, rather than the preservation of a pitiful remnant of "virgin" wilderness with a tall fence around it.

Wondering whether it was possible to produce wilderness, we asked 15 people, all lovers of the outdoors, for their description of a wilderness. From this tiny sample we learned some interesting things. Most defined a wilderness as any area with mature trees, water, cleanliness, solitude, and beauty. We were not very surprised that so many people included beauty as a requisite for wilderness. But we were surprised that so many appended the remarks, "and it ought to have good roads to let us in and see it."

This was a shocker, because the original Wilderness Act called for roadlessness as a requirement for consideration of an area.

The solitude and unspoiled grandeur of the Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana is very beautiful. But the trails of Shenandoah National Park in Virginia are also beautiful. It would be difficult to find 5000 acres without a road in the Shenandoah, and it would be difficult to pretend that the signs of man's former habitation have all disappeared from

the Shenandoah. But why search for the signs of man's former use? The desired wilderness experience is available there now.

Deep in the Bob Marshall Wilderness it is easy to believe that you are the only human who ever set foot there. But 80,000 acres of the Bob Marshall have been logged over since 1900. Would you therefore rule out the Bob Marshall? If you found the cliff dwellings of the pre-Columbian Indians, would you rule out the Gila Wilderness?

If some signs of man are still to be found in a new wilderness area in a generation or two they'll be obscured by the actions of nature. Can't we afford to put up with that process meanwhile? Isn't that better than having no wilderness in this generation?

If you'll agree that wilderness can be "restored," then you will agree that it is ridiculous to have ten million acres of wilderness in the West, where one-quarter of our population lives, and almost no wilderness in the East, where the other three-fourths of us live.

Stripping away the rhetoric, what are the real reasons for the failure of the eastern half to get its share of Forest Service wilderness? Remember that the Forest Service had a big head start in the West—they originated the whole idea of wilderness. The western National Forests were so huge that they could easily spare the acreage for wilderness.

The national forests of Wyoming alone are bigger than all of New Hampshire, nearly as big as Maryland. The national forests of California are just a bit bigger than the whole state of Maine. New Mexico's national forests are bigger than all of Massachusetts. You could put four Connecticut and two Rhode Islands into the national forests of Montana and have room left over for Delaware to slip in on edge. With this tremendous area in national forest, it was easy to designate wilderness areas—almost unnoticed at first.

National forests in the East are comparatively small. Most of the forested lands in the East are privately owned. The Wilderness Act ruled out acquisition of privately owned land by condemnation. The government which cannot condemn land for purchase cannot provide wilderness.

Western-oriented, the Sierra Club deserves much of the credit for supplying the push in the West. The Sierra Club didn't push for wilderness areas in the East, but one did. So the East was left out in the first ten years of the Wilderness System program.

It's time for a new look at the ten-year old, it must be thinking about growing up, about maturing to fit the needs of 1974 and 1994 and 2204. The youngster succeeded in the West, where its aims were in harmony with the other purposes for which the candidate lands were managed, and where the acreage could be "spared" from a tremendous area of national forest land. I think it is time that the maturing wilderness program starts to think about the needs of the three-quarters of our people who live in the eastern half of the nation.

Evidently Congress also notes a lack of progress by the Forest Service in the East. The tenth birthday of the Act saw a spate of Congressional legislation setting up wilderness areas in particular national forests regardless of Forest Service wishes or recommendations. An example is H.R. 4380, introduced by Congressman Gude of Maryland. Gude's bill called for the designation of 28 separate parcels of land in Alabama, Missouri, Florida, Arkansas, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. A dozen companion bills testify to the congressional impatience with a system that has not produced the desired wilderness results in the East.

But it will require more than congressional designation to provide instant wilderness. It will require lots of money to buy privately owned lands. Congressmen who enthusias-

tically introduce authorizing legislation are much less enthusiastic about legislating the needed funds.

To be successful, legislation for eastern wilderness must specifically authorize condemnation as a means of acquiring title to eastern lands.

Without condemnation, there will be no Wilderness East.

A misreading of size regulations represents another obstacle. Contrary to popular opinion, the present act does not insist on a minimum of 5000 acres. But the wording of the law gave many the impression that it "ought to be" 5000 acres. This impression is a crippling requirement in the East. Proper management can restore lands once abused and create wilderness, regardless of the size of the area.

Uncle Sam doesn't own enough land in the East to solve our problem under the present rules. Private land and clear redefining of the requirements must be the source of future eastern wilderness.

Conservation-minded agencies are fond of saying "What we save today is all we will ever have." This is definitely not true of the wilderness. The true situation is that what we plan and construct today is what the eastern wilderness we will have until we plan and construct some more.

Regional planning is the only sensible method of selecting the sites for future eastern wilderness. We must identify the need for wilderness, assign it a rightful place in our priorities, and locate the wilderness near the need it will satisfy. Then we must buy the land and go out and construct wilderness.

One result of sound regional planning might well be "rotating wilderness"—areas designed to satisfy our wilderness needs while their growing and mature trees provide the peace, solitude, and majestic seclusion which many of us have in mind when we visualize wilderness.

This "rotating wilderness" might well be harvested to build American homes when its trees are mature and moving into old age. At that time another area could come into use, and the logged area would be intensively reforested to start the whole cycle over again. Wildlife managers are enthusiastic over this rotating concept because of the great wildlife value—abundant food and shelter—providing for the young forest growing in the timbered areas.

Undoubtedly the concept of rotating wilderness is anathema to many readers. Is it this feeling the result of logical thinking or merely an aversion to change?

To many, it is paradoxical to suggest managed wilderness. But we are already managing humanity within the wilderness areas to avoid damage caused by intensive use. We disperse visitors over large areas, and still we are forced to provide sanitary facilities or risk turning our paradise into a sewage disposal area. We have learned that we must limit access to wilderness, lest we destroy the thing we admire by the sheer weight of our admiring numbers.

We have wilderness west. We can have wilderness east. We will have to pay for it, plan for it, and manage for it. There's no other way.

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE: OPINIONS OF PROF. GEORGE ANASTAPLO ON CYPRUS SITUATION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John Anastaplos, for many years one of the outstanding radio commentators with sta-

tion WJO3 in Hammond, Ind., has forwarded to me excerpts from a transcript of a radio interview with his brother, George Anastaplo, an eminent lecturer and professor of political science and philosophy at the University of Chicago and Rosary College. Professor Anastaplo has been a recognized international authority on Greek history and government for many years.

I am submitting this interesting and revealing interview of July 20, 1974, on WJOB radio, Hammond, Ind., for the enlightenment of the membership:

#### CYPRUS: COUNTDOWN AND THE FOLLY OF THE GREEK COLONELS

JOHN ANASTAPLOS. How does it look on Cyprus, George? On the basis of the little news we've been getting out of there, can you give us some thoughts?

GEORGE ANASTAPLO. My first thought is that something has gone wrong with American policy when two NATO allies such as Turkey and Greece fight each other. I suppose one can also say these hostilities show us that the government in Athens is well on the way to the final bankruptcy of its policies. I know the Greek military government to be desperate. I expected them to do something simply because they have been losing their standing at home. What is now happening is partly the result of a miscalculation on the part of the colonels: They may have figured that the Turks wouldn't do anything if the Makarios government should be overthrown. The action of the Greek army against Archbishop Makarios gave the Turks the opportunity and pretext to do it. Well, the chickens have come home to roost for the Greek colonels. That is, it does seem that the government in Athens, which was evidently behind the coup earlier this week against Makarios, is in some way responsible for what has happened.

JOHN. What do you know about this fellow Sampson, who is now the self-styled President of Cyprus? Do you know anything about him?

GEORGE. Not very much. I gather he's not a nice man.

JOHN. When he took over last Monday, he said that the government of Archbishop Makarios had tortured political opponents and had to be toppled to avoid civil war. That's a throwback to what the colonels were saying in April 1967, isn't it?

GEORGE. The colonels weren't claiming torture then. That has been what the colonels' opponents have claimed since then, and with considerable justification.

JOHN. But they were claiming in 1967 the thwarting of civil war.

GEORGE. There is, I should notice first of all, some question in the press about the torture claims now being made against the Makarios government. The people who have been said to have been tortured on Cyprus are also said by others to be quite jolly and untortured looking when not in front of cameras. Whatever threat of civil war there was this past week on Cyprus came because of the conduct of the contingent of Greek officials stationed on Cyprus pursuant to the treaty which established the independence of Cyprus. Those officers are under the control of the government in Athens. Makarios has been trying to get them out of there, or to rotate them more frequently, for he saw them as a threat to his security. Whether he went about getting them out of there in the best possible way remains to be seen. It's also evident that Makarios has been, for some years now, the overwhelming favorite of the Greek Cypriots.

JOHN. Does Turkey feel that the new rulers will not be as amicable as was Archbishop Makarios when it comes to getting the two ethnic groups together?

GEORGE. They know that Makarios has